

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/082,243 02/26/2002		Naoya Ichikawa	2809-0124P	3483	
	7590 07/29/2004	EXAMINER			
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			MULCAHY, PETER D		
FALLS CHUR	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1713		
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-1			
	\	Ap	plication No.	Applicant(s)	
	Office Action Comme		/082,243	ICHIKAWA ET AL.	
	Office Action Summa	Ex	aminer	Art Unit	
			ter D. Mulcahy	1713	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this co or Reply	mmunication appears	on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PER MAILING DATE OF THIS CON insions of time may be available under the p SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the period for reply specified above is less than a period for reply is specified above, the may be period for reply in the set or extended period reply received by the Office later than three led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	MMUNICATION. rovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). his communication. hthirty (30) days, a reply withir dimum statutory period will app for reply will, by statute, cause months after the mailing date or	In no event, however, may a real the statutory minimum of thirdly and will expire SIX (6) MON	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communic	cation.
Status		, ,			
1) 又	Responsive to communication	(s) filed on 25 May 2	004		
	This action is FINAL .	2b) ☐ This action			
	Since this application is in con			ers, prosecution as to the most	te ie
	closed in accordance with the				.S 13
)ienoci+i	on of Claims		. 7.2, 1222 3.8	,	
	Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are per	- • •			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-1		m consideration.		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-9</u> is/are reject				
	Claim(s) is/are objected				
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to	restriction and/or elec	ction requirement.		
Applicati	on Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to	by the Examiner.			
	The drawing(s) filed on i		or b) objected to b	ov the Examiner	
·	Applicant may not request that an	v objection to the drawing	ng(s) be held in abevan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a)	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) inc				21(4)
11) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is object	ted to by the Examin	er. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152	: I(u). >
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	3,100		••
		oloim for form		444.5.4.5	
۱ <i>۵۱۱</i> ۵۱ ماری	Acknowledgment is made of a d ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None	્રુથામાં મારા toteldu buoti	ty under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
			- h		
				*	
	2. Certified copies of the pr	ionty documents have	e been received in Ap	oplication No	
,	3. Copies of the certified co			received in this National Stage	
* 0	application from the Inter				
20	ee the attached detailed Office	action for a list of the	certified copies not r	eceived.	
ttachment(s)				
	of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview St	mmary (PTO-413)	
) 🔲 Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev		Paper No(s)	/Mail Date	
I Inform	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14	149 or PTO/SB/08)	5) U Notice of Inf	ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
	No(s)/Mail Date	,	6) 🔲 Other:		

Art Unit 1713

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,253.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the specific combination of surfactants called for in the instant claimed invention is rendered prima facie obvious from the process as claimed in the patent which specifically directs one of ordinary skill in the art to select surfactant from the group can be the same as those instantly claimed. The utilization of two of these surfactants claimed is rendered prima facie obvious because the surfactants are listed in the alternative and it is prima facie obvious to select and combine ingredients and have them function

Serial No. 10/082,243

Art Unit 1713

in an expected manner. The claims of the patent are in no way limited to only the incorporation of a single surfactant. Furthermore column 6 line 8 specifically references "a combination of specific surfactants." This language is sufficient so as to render the instantly claimed combination of surfactants prima facie obvious. .

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Tanaka et al., U.S. Patent 6,239,253 or 5,910,567 or 5,610,212 each taken alone and in the alternative.

The rejection as set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is deemed proper and is herein repeated.

Once again applicants argue that the prior art does not teach the utilization of a combination of surfactants as instantly claimed. This is not persuasive.

Serial No. 10/082,243
Art Unit 1713

As pointed out, the '253 patent at column 6 line 8 specifically calls for a combination of surfactants. Furthermore the instantly claimed preferred surfactants possessing the properties are listed in columns 7 and 8. One of ordinary skill in the art is directed and encouraged to select a combination of the surfactants. As such, it would be prima facie obvious to select the surfactants as claimed. The '567 patent is also seen to direct one of ordinary skill in the art to select a combination of surfactants. See specifically column 4 lines 13+. As such, applicants' remarks are not persuasive.

The '212 patent lists all of the surfactants which are suitable and in no way limits the invention to a single surfactant. Furthermore combinations of surfactants are suggested at column 4 line 58.

This application contains claims 10-12 drawn to an invention non-elected with traverse in Paper No. 110303. A complete response to the final rejection must include cancellation of non-elected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) MPEP § 821.01.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first

Art Unit 1713

response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached during regular business hours.

The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P. Mulcahy:cdc July 27, 2004

PETER D. MULCAHY
PRIMARY EXAMINER